



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/754,018	01/03/2001	Motoshi Ito	YAMAP0748US	3434
7590	02/14/2006		EXAMINER	
Neil A. DuChez Renner, Otto, Boisselle, & Sklar, L.L.P. 19th Floor 1621 Euclid Avenue Cleveland, OH 44115			HENNING, MATTHEW T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	
DATE MAILED: 02/14/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/754,018	ITO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Matthew T. Henning	2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-9 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 01 December 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2131

1 This action is in response to the communication filed on 12/01/2005.

2 **DETAILED ACTION**

3 *Response to Arguments*

4 Applicant's arguments filed 12/01/2005 have been fully considered but they are not
5 persuasive. Applicants argue primarily that:

6 a. Neither Oishi, nor the combination of Hirotani, Oishi, and Schneier, disclose
7 using a single circuit for data scramble and error correction.
8 b. Oishi does not teach that a data scramble circuit acts as part of an error correction
9 circuit.
10 c. The examiner cannot "pick and choose" from the teachings of Oishi.

11 Regarding applicants' argument a., that neither Oishi, nor the combination of Hirotani,
12 Oishi, and Schneier, disclose using a single circuit for data scramble and error correction, the
13 examiner does not find the argument persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the
14 references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon
15 which applicant relies (i.e., a single circuit for data scramble and error correction) are not recited
16 in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification,
17 limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988
18 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Therefore, the examiner does not find the
19 argument persuasive.

20 Regarding applicants' argument b., that Oishi does not teach that a data scramble circuit
21 acts as part of an error correction circuit, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.
22 Oishi clearly teaches an error correction system in which the error correction codes are decoded

Art Unit: 2131

1 by a decryption circuit prior to the decrypted codes being used to correct errors. This can be
2 seen in Oishi Fig. 4 and Col. 5 Lines 37-46. Because the decryption by the decryption circuit is
3 necessary in order for error correction by the error correction circuit to occur, the decryption
4 circuit **acts as part of the error correction circuit**. Therefore, the examiner does not find the
5 argument persuasive.

6 Regarding applicants' c., that the examiner cannot "pick and choose" from the teachings
7 of Oishi, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive. It is not clear from the argument
8 how the examiner picked and chose from the teachings of Oishi. The examiner has merely taken
9 the teachings of Oishi regarding error correction and combined them with the decryption of
10 Hirotani. Oishi provided two embodiments and both include the decryption and error correction
11 relied upon in the combination. The only difference between the two embodiments is that in the
12 second embodiment the type of encryption is determined on the fly. Therefore, the combination
13 is proper and the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.

14 Because the examiner does not find the arguments persuasive, the examiner has
15 maintained the prior art rejections previously presented.

16 All objections and rejections not presented below have been withdrawn.

17 ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

18 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
19 obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

20 *A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically
21 disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences
22 between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that
23 the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention
24 was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter*

Art Unit: 2131

1 *pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the*
2 *invention was made.*

3
4 Claims 1, 3, and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
5 Hirotani (US Patent Number 5,982,887), further in view of Oishi (US Patent Number 6,907,125),
6 and further in view of Schneier (Applied Cryptography).

7 Regarding claim 1, Hirotani disclosed a control program for controlling an operation of a
8 microprocessor (See Hirotani Col. 4 Paragraph 3), the control program comprising a concealed
9 program (See Hirotani Col. 3 Paragraph 7), recoverable by data scramble circuit (See Hirotani
10 Col. 3 Paragraph 8) and a non-concealed program (See Hirotani Fig. 1 Element 15 wherein only
11 part of the program is encrypted). However, Hirotani failed to disclose the data scramble circuit
12 being a hardware circuit acting as part of an error correction circuit.

13 Oishi teaches that in order to protect against errors in a decryption system, error
14 correction can be combined with the decryption system by encrypting error correction codes as
15 well as the stored data and then decrypting the codes and using the codes in error correction (See
16 Oishi Col. 3 Paragraph 4 and Col. 4 – Col. 6 Line 23)

17 Schneier teaches that encryption and decryption can be performed in a hardware circuit
18 (See Schneier Pages 223-225).

19 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
20 invention to employ the teachings of Oishi and Schneier in the decryption system of Hirotani by
21 utilizing the decryption/error correction system of Oishi for the decryption of Hirotani and
22 further by providing a hardware decryption circuit to be used in place of the CPU decryption.
23 This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been

Art Unit: 2131

1 motivated to protect the integrity of the program in a cost efficient manner, and further would
2 have been motivated to increase the speed of the decryption, increase the security of the
3 decryption, ease in the installation of the decryption method, and increase the efficiency of the
4 CPU.

5 Regarding claim 3, the combination of Hirotani disclosed a device, comprising: a
6 microprocessor (See Hirotani Fig. 3 Element 21), a program memory for storing a control
7 program for controlling an operation of the microprocessor (See Hirotani Fig. 3 Element 25), the
8 control program including a concealed program (Element 25 Encrypted Section) and a non-
9 concealed program (Element 25 Program section); a rewritable memory for storing a copy of the
10 concealed program copied from the concealed program stored in the program memory (See
11 Hirotani Col. 6 Paragraph 2 and the rejection of claim 1 above wherein it was inherent that the
12 encrypted program was stored, at least temporarily in a rewritable memory in the decryption
13 circuit, before decryption), and a data scramble circuit for recovering the concealed program
14 stored in the rewritable memory as a recovered program (See Hirotani Col. 6 Paragraphs 2-3 and
15 the rejection of claim 1 above), but failed to disclose that the data scramble circuit was a
16 hardware circuit acting as part of an error correction circuit.

17 Oishi teaches that in order to protect against errors in a decryption system, error
18 correction can be combined with the decryption system by encrypting error correction codes as
19 well as the stored data and then decrypting the codes and using the codes in error correction (See
20 Oishi Col. 3 Paragraph 4 and Col. 4 – Col. 6 Line 23)

21 Schneier teaches that encryption and decryption can be performed in a hardware circuit
22 (See Schneier Pages 223-225).

Art Unit: 2131

1 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
2 invention to employ the teachings of Oishi and Schneier in the decryption system of Hirotani by
3 utilizing the decryption/error correction system of Oishi for the decryption of Hirotani and
4 further by providing a hardware decryption circuit to be used in place of the CPU decryption.
5 This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been
6 motivated to protect the integrity of the program in a cost efficient manner, and further would
7 have been motivated to increase the speed of the decryption, increase the security of the
8 decryption, ease in the installation of the decryption method, and increase the efficiency of the
9 CPU.

10 Regarding claim 6, the combination of Hirotani disclosed a method for creating a control
11 program, comprising: a program descramble step of descrambling a portion of a control program
12 by reverse scramble of a data scramble circuit in a device to be controlled, thereby creating a
13 concealed program as a portion of the control program (it was inherent in the invention of
14 Hirotani that a portion of the control program was encrypted in order for the control program to
15 have taken on the form of Element 25 in Fig. 3); and a program storing step of storing the control
16 program including the concealed program in a program memory so that the control program
17 controls an operation of a microprocessor in the device to be controlled (See Hirotani Col. 5 lines
18 39-44), but failed to disclose that the data scramble circuit was a hardware circuit acting as part
19 of an error correction circuit.

20 Oishi teaches that in order to protect against errors in a decryption system, error
21 correction can be combined with the decryption system by encrypting error correction codes as

Art Unit: 2131

1 well as the stored data and then decrypting the codes and using the codes in error correction (See
2 Oishi Col. 3 Paragraph 4 and Col. 4 – Col. 6 Line 23)

3 Schneier teaches that encryption and decryption can be performed in a hardware circuit
4 (See Schneier Pages 223-225).

5 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
6 invention to employ the teachings of Oishi and Schneier in the decryption system of Hirotani by
7 utilizing the decryption/error correction system of Oishi for the decryption of Hirotani and
8 further by providing a hardware decryption circuit to be used in place of the CPU decryption.

9 This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been
10 motivated to protect the integrity of the program in a cost efficient manner, and further would
11 have been motivated to increase the speed of the decryption, increase the security of the
12 decryption, ease in the installation of the decryption method, and increase the efficiency of the
13 CPU.

14 Regarding claim 8, the combination of Hirotani disclosed a method for operating a
15 control program, comprising: a program copying step of copying a concealed program which is a
16 portion of the control program (See Hirotani Fig. 3 Element 25) from a program memory into a
17 rewritable memory (See rejection of claim 3 above); a program recovery step of recovering the
18 concealed program copied by the program copying step as a recovered program by a data
19 scramble circuit (See rejection of claim 3 above); and a program execution step of executing a
20 non-concealed program included in the control program and the recovered program (See Hirotani
21 Col. 6 Paragraph 5), but failed to disclose that the data scramble circuit was a hardware circuit
22 acting as part of an error correction circuit.

Art Unit: 2131

1 Oishi teaches that in order to protect against errors in a decryption system, error
2 correction can be combined with the decryption system by encrypting error correction codes as
3 well as the stored data and then decrypting the codes and using the codes in error correction (See
4 Oishi Col. 3 Paragraph 4 and Col. 4 – Col. 6 Line 23)

5 Schneier teaches that encryption and decryption can be performed in a hardware circuit
6 (See Schneier Pages 223-225).

7 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
8 invention to employ the teachings of Oishi and Schneier in the decryption system of Hirotani by
9 utilizing the decryption/error correction system of Oishi for the decryption of Hirotani and
10 further by providing a hardware decryption circuit to be used in place of the CPU decryption.
11 This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been
12 motivated to protect the integrity of the program in a cost efficient manner, and further would
13 have been motivated to increase the speed of the decryption, increase the security of the
14 decryption, ease in the installation of the decryption method, and increase the efficiency of the
15 CPU.

16 Regarding claim 7, the combination of Hirotani, Oishi, and Schneier disclosed that the
17 program descramble step includes the steps of: creating a non-concealed program (it was
18 inherent that the program was created at some point in order for the program to have been
19 encrypted and downloaded); and synthesizing the concealed program and the non-concealed
20 program into the control program (See Hirotani Fig. 3 Element 25 wherein the encrypted and
21 non-encrypted programs are together as the program stored in program memory).

Art Unit: 2131

1 Regarding claim 9, the combination of Hirotani, Oishi and Schneier disclosed a program
2 erasure step of erasing the recovered program from the rewritable memory (See Hirotani Col. 6
3 Paragraph 6).

4 Claims 2, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the
5 combination of Hirotani, Oishi, and Schneier disclosed as applied to claims 1 and 3 respectively
6 above, and further in view of Oualline ("Practical C++ Programming") and Ooi et al. (U.S.
7 Patent Number 5,226,129) hereinafter referred to as Ooi.

8 The combination of Hirotani, Oishi, and Schneier disclosed a recoverable encrypted
9 program to be run on a microprocessor (See rejection of claim 1 above) but Hirotani failed to
10 disclose the composition of the program as well as the addressing mode of the program.
11 However, Hirotani did disclose that the encrypted program could have been downloaded over a
12 network (See Hirotani Col. 3 Lines 27-29).

13 Oualline teaches that in order to conserve memory space, commonly used code can be
14 grouped into functions such that the code can be used repeatedly (See Oualline Page 133
15 Paragraph 1). Ooi teaches that in order to easily make a program portable, the program should
16 use relative addressing (See Ooi Col. 1 Lines 27-33).

17 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
18 invention to employ the teachings of Oualline to create functions in the encrypted program of
19 Hirotani, Oishi, and Schneier. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person
20 skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the program as compact as possible in
21 order to conserve memory and also to limit the amount of information needing to be transferred
22 over the network to the system of Hirotani. It further would have been obvious to the ordinary

Art Unit: 2131

1 person skilled in the art at the time of invention to employ the teachings of Ooi in the program of
2 Hirotani, Oishi, and Schneier by providing the program with relative addressing. This would
3 have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to
4 minimize the modification of the code required to relocate the program, and thus increase
5 portability.

6 It would have been obvious in the combination of Hirotani, Oishi, Schneier, Oualline,
7 and Ooi that relative address lists for the functions of the program would be provided in the
8 program at prescribed, or predetermined, location, in order for the processor of Hirotani to be
9 able to locate the functions called throughout the program.

10 *Conclusion*

11 Claims 1-3, and 5-9 have been rejected.

12 **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time
13 policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

14 A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
15 MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO
16 MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after
17 the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period
18 will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37
19 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,
20 however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing
21 date of this final action.

22

Art Unit: 2131

1 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
2 examiner should be directed to Matthew T. Henning whose telephone number is (571) 272-3790.
3 The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

4 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
5 supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the
6 organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

7 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent
8 Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications
9 may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished
10 applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR
11 system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
12 system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

13

14

15 
16 Matthew Henning
17 Assistant Examiner
18 Art Unit 2131
19 2/8/2006


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100